

**REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claims 1-33 are pending, of which claim 12 has been amended to correct an informality noted by the Applicant.

5

**Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 2-3 and 7 are indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form (*Office Action* p.11). Applicant appreciates the indication of allowability.

10        Claims 12 and 21 were indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form in the previous Office Action dated November 5, 2004, p.11. In the previous Response dated December 28, 2004, Applicant submitted:

15        Claims 22 and 26 were amended to include the allowable feature(s) of claim 12. Accordingly, claim 22 along with dependent claims 23-25, and claim 26 along with dependent claims 27-29 were placed in condition for allowance.

      New claim 30 was presented as a combination of claim 1 and allowable claim 12. New claim 31 was also presented to include the allowable feature(s) of claim 12. Accordingly, new claims 30 and 31 were placed in condition for allowance.

20        New claim 32 was presented as a combination of claims 14, 19, and allowable claim 21. New claim 33 was also presented to include the allowable feature(s) of claim 21. Accordingly, new claims 32 and 33 were placed in condition for allowance.

25        Claims 12 and 21 are now rejected over Kambayashi and, as described below, Applicant disagrees that Kambayashi teaches or suggests the allowable features of claims 12 and 21. Without some indication from the Office as to

how Kambayashi is being relied upon to reject claims 12 and 21, claims 12, 21, and 22-33 remain in condition for allowance.

**35 U.S.C. §103 Claim Rejections**

5           Claims 1, 4-6, 8-11, and 13-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over U.S. Patent No. 5,805,412 to Yanagisawa et al. (hereinafter, "Yanagisawa") (*Office Action* p.2). Applicant respectfully traverses the claim rejections.

10           Claims 1, 12, 14, and 21-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over U.S. Patent No. 6,724,615 to Kambayashi et al. (hereinafter, "Kambayashi") (*Office Action* p.8). Applicant respectfully traverses the claim rejections.

**Examiner's Response**

15           In Response to Applicant's Arguments (*Office Action* pp.11-12), the Office expresses that an input/output module of a docking station is "connected/attached/installed" into the housing of a mobile computing device, and that the housing of the computing device includes a rear port that allows the input/output module to be installed within the rear port housing of the  
20   computer. As such, the Examiner's position is that the rear port of the computer is part of the overall housing inset of the computer, and the input/output module is configured for installation to the computer's overall housing. (*Office Action* pp.11-12).

25           Applicant respectfully disagrees with the comparison because the Office is referring to a connector of the docking station in Yanagisawa as the claimed input/output module. Although, a connector of the docking station (which the Office is referring to as an input/output module of the docking station) is

installed within a rear port connector of the computer, the docking station itself is not installed within the housing of the computer as the Office implies.

Applicant's claim 1, for example, recites that an input/output module is configured for installation within a housing inset of a housing of the mobile  
5 computing device. That is, the input/output module itself can be installed within the housing inset of the computing device housing. For example, Applicant's Figs. 2-3 clearly illustrate that an input/output module (20) itself installs within a housing inset (32) of a computer housing – not just a connector (34) of the input/output module.

10 Yanagisawa's Figs. 1 and 4 illustrate that a docking unit (200) has a connector (221) which engages a docking connector (130) of a notebook computer (100). The docking unit connector (221) merely engages the docking connector (130) of the notebook computer – the docking unit itself is not configured for installation within a housing inset of a housing of the notebook  
15 computer, as Applicant claims (*see* claim 1, for example).

Kambayashi's Figs. 2A-B illustrate that a connector box (53) has a connector (55) which engages a connector (51) in a housing of a computer (1). The connector (55) merely engages the connector (51) of the computer – the connector box itself is not configured for installation within a housing inset of a  
20 housing of the notebook computer, as Applicant claims (*see* claim 1, for example).

Accordingly, Yanagisawa and/or Kambayashi do not teach or suggest an input/output module that can be installed within a housing inset of a computing device housing, as recited in claims of the subject application.

25

Claim 1 recites a system comprising “an input/output module configured for installation within a housing inset of a housing of the mobile computing

device, the input/output module configured to interlock within the housing inset to facilitate portability of the mobile computing device with the input/output module installed”.

Yanagisawa and/or Kambayashi do not teach an input/output module  
5 configured for installation within a housing inset of a housing of the mobile computing device, as recited in claim 1. Yanagisawa and/or Kambayashi also do not teach an input/output module configured to interlock within the housing inset to facilitate portability of the mobile computing device with the input/output module installed, as recited in claim 1.

10 As described above, Yanagisawa describes a docking unit that can be coupled with and separated from a notebook computer, and that has a connector which engages a docking connector of the notebook computer (*Yanagisawa* col.5, lines 31-36; Figs. 1 and 4). The docking unit of Yanagisawa is not configured for installation within a housing inset of a  
15 housing of the mobile computing device, as recited in claim 1. The connector of the docking unit in Yanagisawa merely engages the docking connector on a rear face of the notebook computer (*Yanagisawa* col.7, lines 12-14).

Additionally, the docking unit of Yanagisawa does not interlock within  
20 a housing inset to facilitate portability of a mobile computing device, as recited in claim 1. To the contrary, the docking unit of Yanagisawa provides a fixed computing location for cable management which teaches away from the portability of a mobile computing device.

Further, Kambayashi describes that a connector box has a connector  
25 which engages a common connector on the rear surface of a personal computer (*Kambayashi* col.3, lines 57-63). The connector box of Kambayashi is not configured for installation within a housing inset of a housing of the mobile

computing device, as recited in claim 1. The connector of the connector box in Kambayashi merely engages the common connector on a rear surface of the personal computer (*Kambayashi* col.3, lines 57-63).

Accordingly, claim 1 along with dependent claims 2-13 are allowable  
5 over Yanagisawa and/or Kambayashi for at least the reasons described above, and Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejections be withdrawn.

Claim 12 recites that “a module connector includes a pin configuration that can be decoded by the mobile computing device to determine an  
10 input/output connector configuration on the input/output module.”

Kambayashi does not teach or suggest that a computing device can decode a module connector pin configuration to determine an input/output connector configuration on an input/output module, as recited in claim 12. The Office generally refers to all of Kambayashi for teaching this feature (*Office*  
15 *Action* pp.9-10). However, there is no indication in Kambayashi of determining an input/output connector configuration on an input/output module from a module connector pin configuration, as recited in claim 12.

Without a better indication from the Office as to how Kambayashi is being relied upon to reject the feature(s) recited in claim 12, the rejection  
20 should be withdrawn and claim 12 allowed.

Claim 14 recites “an interchangeable input/output module configured for installation within a housing inset of a mobile computer, the interchangeable input/output module configured to interlock within the housing inset to  
25 facilitate portability of the mobile computer with the interchangeable input/output module installed”.

As described above in the response to the rejection of claim 1, Yanagisawa and/or Kambayashi do not teach an interchangeable input/output module configured for installation within a housing inset of a mobile computer, as recited in claim 14. Accordingly, claim 14 along with dependent claims  
5 15-21 are allowable over Yanagisawa and/or Kambayashi for at least the reasons described above, and Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejections be withdrawn.

Claim 21 recites that “the input/output connector configuration identifier  
10 is decoded from a pin configuration in the input/output module”.

As described above in the response to the rejection of claim 12, there is no indication in Kambayashi that an input/output connector configuration identifier is decoded from a pin configuration in the input/output module, as recited in claim 21. Further, without a better indication from the Office as to  
15 how Kambayashi is being relied upon to reject the feature(s) recited in claim 21, the rejection should be withdrawn and claim 21 allowed.

Independent Claims 22, 26, and 30-33 each include the allowable feature(s) of claim 12 or 21 as described above in the section entitled  
20 Allowable Subject Matter. As described above in the response to the rejection of claims 12 and 21, Kambayashi does not teach or suggest the feature(s) of either claim. Accordingly, claims 22-25, 26-29, and 30-33 are allowable over Kambayashi, and Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

25

**Conclusion**

Pending claims 1-33 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the subject application. If any issues remain that preclude issuance of this application, the Examiner is  
5 urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

10 Dated: July 19, 2005

By: 

David A. Morasch  
Lee & Hayes, PLLC  
Reg. No. 42,905  
(509) 324-9256 x 210